



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,878	07/10/2003	Richard W. Ettinger JR.	488230.0002	2641

7590 10/02/2006
MC CARTER & ENGLISH, LLP
FOUR STAMFORD PLAZA
107 ELM STREET
STAMFORD, CT 06902

EXAMINER

MOONEYHAM, JANICE A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3629

DATE MAILED: 10/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/616,878	Applicant(s) ETTINGER, RICHARD W.	
	Examiner Janice A. Mooneyham	Art Unit 3629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to applicant's communication filed on 7/10/2003, wherein claims 1-20 are currently pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 2/19/2004 is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2, 4, 7-11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Conklin et al. (U.S. 6,338,050).

Conklin discloses a method and system for conducting a computer-based negotiation, comprising:

a processor that is adapted to communicate with a network (Conklin et al. col. 17, lines 14-34, "engine system communicating over telecommunications link to the internet") ,

: receiving an offer from a first location across a network at a processor (Conklin et al. fig. 7, item 540);

Art Unit: 3629

automatically assessing the offer against predefined acceptance criteria (Conklin et al. fig. 7, item 532);

in the event the offer does not satisfy the predefined acceptance criteria,
automatically generating one or more counter offers (Conklin et al. col. 14,
lines 1-29);

automatically transmitting said one or more counter offers across said network to said
first location (Conklin et al. col. 17, lines 14-34, "engine system communicating over
telecommunications link to the internet").

one or more counter offers includes one or more combinations of quantity and price
(Conklin et al. col. 17, lines 14-34, "engine system communicating over
telecommunications link to the internet").

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all
obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148
USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining
obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

Art Unit: 3629

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-2, 4, 7-11 and 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conklin et al. et al. (U.S. 6,338,050) in view of Himmelstein (U.S. 6,338,050).

Conklin discloses a method and system for conducting a computer-based negotiation, comprising (Conklin et al. col. 17, lines 14-34, "engine system communicating over telecommunications link to the internet"):

Conklin does not explicitly disclose generation of said one or more counter offers includes use of a randomization factor, one or more counter offers includes a buy-now option, or transmitting a wait period based on said predetermined criteria.

However Himmelstein teaches generation of said one or more counter offers includes use of a randomization factor (Himmelstein [0066], one or more counter offers includes a buy-now option (Himmelstein [0062], or transmitting a wait period based on said predetermined criteria [0060]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate into the negotiating system of Conklin et al. the options set forth in Himmelstein in order to allow for more completing transactions. Thereby increasing sales volume for the seller and more completed transactions for the buyer.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Janice A. Mooneyham whose telephone number is (571) 272-6805. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on (571) 272-6812. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jan Mooneyham
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3629

